

Jeffrey F. Barr (NV Bar No. 7269)  
8275 South Eastern Avenue, Suite 200  
Las Vegas, NV 89123  
(702) 631-4755  
barrj@ashcraftbarr.com

Thomas R. McCarthy\* (VA Bar No. 47145)  
Gilbert C. Dickey\* (VA Bar No. 98858)  
Conor D. Woodfin\* (VA Bar No. 98937)  
1600 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 700  
Arlington, VA 22209  
(703) 243-9423  
tom@consovoymccarthy.com  
gilbert@consovoymccarthy.com  
conor@consovoymccarthy.com

Sigal Chattah (NV Bar No. 8264)  
5875 S. Rainbow Blvd #204  
Las Vegas, NV 89118  
(702) 360-6200  
sigal@thegoodlawyerlv.com

*\*Admitted pro hac vice*

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

REPUBLICAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE,  
NEVADA REPUBLICAN PARTY, and SCOTT  
JOHNSTON,

Plaintiffs,

v.

FRANCISCO AGUILAR, *in his official capacity  
as Nevada Secretary of State*; LORENA  
PORTILLO, *in her official capacity as the  
Registrar of Voters for Clark County*; WILLIAM  
"SCOTT" HOEN, AMY BURGANS, STACI  
LINDBERG, and JIM HINDLE, *in their official  
capacities as County Clerks*,

Defendants.

No. 2:24-cv-00518-CDS-MDC

**RESPONSE IN  
OPPOSITION TO  
INTERVENORS' MOTION  
TO DISMISS AMENDED  
COMPLAINT**

1 Plaintiffs file this response in opposition to the Intervenor-Defendants' motion  
 2 to dismiss. *See* Interv. Mot. (Doc. 104). The Intervenor's motion raises most of the  
 3 same arguments as the Secretary's motion to dismiss (Doc. 101). To aid the Court's  
 4 review, Plaintiffs incorporate their arguments made in response to the Secretary, to  
 5 the extent those same arguments are made by the Intervenor. Plaintiffs expand in  
 6 this response on the unique arguments made by the Intervenor.

### 7 ARGUMENT

#### 8 **I. The RNC and the NVGOP have plausibly alleged harm to their core** 9 **mission.**

10 Courts generally "have no difficulty concluding" that organizations suffer an  
 11 injury "attributable to the State" in NVRA cases when the Defendants' violations  
 12 disrupt the organizations' mission. *Nat'l Council of La Raza v. Cegavske*, 800 F.3d  
 13 1032, 1041 (9th Cir. 2015). The amended complaint alleges that Defendants' violation  
 14 of the NVRA inflates the voter rolls, which directly injures the RNC and NVGOP's  
 15 mission to elect Republican candidates and turn out Republican voters. Amend.  
 16 Compl. (Doc. 98) ¶¶13-20, 23-26. "[T]here can be no question" that harm to the  
 17 organizations' core mission is an "injury in fact." *Havens Realty Corp. v. Coleman*, 455  
 18 U.S. 363, 379 (1982); *see also FDA v. All. for Hippocratic Med.*, 602 U.S. 367, 395  
 19 (2024).

20 The Intervenor's claim that Plaintiffs don't "explain" those injuries. Interv. Mot.  
 21 at 9. But the amended complaint is full of details explaining exactly how bloated rolls  
 22 injure the RNC and NVGOP's mission. The RNC and NVGOP rely on registration  
 23 numbers to form their electoral strategies and to advise candidates. Amend. Compl.  
 24 ¶¶15, 17. Inflated rolls cause the RNC and NVGOP to spend limited funds on those  
 25 efforts, contacting voters who are not registered or eligible to vote. ¶¶14-15. The RNC  
 26 and NVGOP must divert funds from voter-registration and get-out-the-vote  
 27 initiatives, which are essential to the RNC and NVGOP's mission to elect Republican  
 28 candidates. *Id.* Inflated rolls harm the RNC and NVGOP's ballot-chase efforts by

1 resulting in more ineligible voters receiving mail ballots. ¶16. And all of these injuries  
2 harm “the core electoral missions” of the RNC and NVGOP. ¶18, 25.

3 The Intervenor suggests that these injuries don’t suffice because they’re just  
4 “ordinary campaign expenses.” Interv. Mot. at 8-9. But a “diversion-of-resources  
5 theory does not require a plaintiff to pursue an entirely new mission in order to gain  
6 standing.” *Black Voters Matter Fund v. Raffensperger*, 508 F. Supp. 3d 1283, 1292  
7 (N.D. Ga. 2020). In fact, showing that the defendants’ violations “affected and  
8 interfered” with the plaintiffs’ “core business activities” is the heart of organizational  
9 standing. *All. for Hippocratic Med.*, 602 U.S. at 395. And the “core business” of the  
10 RNC is “electing Republican candidates and turn out Republican voters in local, state,  
11 and federal elections.” Amend. Compl. ¶13. By discounting Plaintiffs’ injuries *because*  
12 they affect Plaintiffs’ core activities, the Intervenor gets it backwards. So long as the  
13 complaint “alleges that Plaintiffs expended additional resources that they would not  
14 otherwise have expended, and in ways that they would not have expended them,” the  
15 plaintiffs have standing. *Nat’l Council of La Raza*, 800 F.3d at 1039; *see also Tex.*  
16 *Democratic Party v. Benkiser*, 459 F.3d 582, 586 (5th Cir. 2006) (Texas Democratic  
17 Party had standing to challenge a Republican candidate’s removal from the ballot  
18 because it would have to rework its campaign).

19 Moreover, that the RNC and NVGOP might spend *some money* on ballot-chase  
20 efforts and other programs absent Defendants’ violations does not mean that the  
21 additional expenses don’t harm their mission. In *La Raza*, the Ninth Circuit held that  
22 a voter-registration organization had standing under the NVRA because “[r]esources  
23 Plaintiffs put toward registering someone who would likely have been registered by  
24 the State, had it complied with the NVRA, are resources they would have spent on  
25 some other aspect of their organizational purpose.” *Nat’l Council of La Raza*, 800 F.3d  
26 at 1040. Swap out voter-registration for voter-turnout, and *La Raza* describes this  
27 case: “Because Nevada automatically sends all active voters a mail ballot” the RNC  
28 must “divert resources to ensure it is chasing mail ballots of eligible voters, rather

1 than ballots mailed to voters who are no longer eligible to vote.” Amend. Compl. ¶16.  
2 So long as “a portion of the resources” spent on an activity is attributable to  
3 counteracting the challenged law, an organization has standing. *ACORN v. Fowler*,  
4 178 F.3d 350, 361 (5th Cir. 1999); *see also Havens Realty*, 455 U.S. at 379 (holding  
5 that plaintiff organization had standing because it was forced to divert more resources  
6 toward investigating the defendant’s “racially discriminatory steering practices”  
7 because of the challenged conduct).

8 The Intervenor’s traceability argument suffers from the same problem. They  
9 suggest that because the Plaintiffs don’t know whether a marginal voter is on the rolls  
10 due to error, they can’t show that their injuries are traceable to Defendants’ violations.  
11 Interv. Mot. at 9-10. That misunderstands how the Plaintiffs use voter rolls. The RNC  
12 and NVGOP rely “on voter registration lists to determine [their] plans and budgets,”  
13 for example. Amend. Compl. ¶14. They don’t make those decisions on a voter-by-voter  
14 basis. But when a state or county has hundreds of thousands of ineligible voters on  
15 the rolls, and “more registered voters than they have adult citizens who are over the  
16 age of 18,” ¶4, it impedes the Plaintiffs’ ability form strategies and run an effective  
17 campaign, ¶¶15-17.

18 In any event, when an organization “divert[s] more resources to accomplishing  
19 its goals” because of a challenged law, it suffers an “injury in fact,” even if “the added  
20 cost has not been estimated and may be slight.” *Fla. State Conf. of NAACP v.*  
21 *Browning*, 522 F.3d 1153, 1165 (11th Cir. 2008) (emphasis added) (quoting *Crawford*  
22 *v. Marion Cnty. Election Bd.*, 472 F.3d 949, 951 (7th Cir. 2007), *aff’d*, 553 U.S. 181  
23 (2008)). The amended complaint contains detailed allegations of how bloated rolls  
24 force the RNC and NVGOP to waste a variety of advocacy, education, and strategic  
25 resources. “It is *these* wasted resources, which [Plaintiffs] could have put ... toward  
26 any other use ... that provide [Plaintiffs] with standing.” *ACORN*, 178 F.3d at 361  
27 (emphasis added).

Just this week, the Southern District of Mississippi ruled that similar facts in affidavits were enough to find standing for the RNC and Mississippi Republican Party on summary judgment. *RNC v. Wetzel*, Doc. 104, No. 1:24-cv-25 (S.D. Miss. July 28, 2024). Here, the allegations must be taken as true. Any they allege “[s]uch concrete and demonstrable injury to the organization’s activities” that it would be “improper for the District Court to dismiss for lack of standing.” *Havens Realty*, 455 U.S. at 379.

### CONCLUSION

The Court should deny the Intervenor’s motion to dismiss.

Dated: July 30, 2024

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Jeffrey F. Barr

Thomas R. McCarthy\*  
 VA Bar No. 47145  
 Gilbert C. Dickey\*  
 VA Bar No. 98858  
 Conor D. Woodfin\*  
 VA Bar No. 98937  
 CONSOVOY MCCARTHY PLLC  
 1600 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 700  
 Arlington, VA 22209  
 (703) 243-9423  
 tom@consovoymccarthy.com  
 gilbert@consovoymccarthy.com  
 conor@consovoymccarthy.com

Jeffrey F. Barr  
 NV Bar No. 7269  
 ASHCRAFT & BARR LLP  
 8275 South Eastern Avenue  
 Suite 200  
 Las Vegas, NV 89123  
 (702) 631-4755  
 barrj@ashcraftbarr.com

*Counsel for the Republican  
 National Committee and Scott  
 Johnston*

/s/ Sigal Chattah

*\*admitted pro hac vice*

*Counsel for Plaintiffs*

Sigal Chattah  
 NV Bar No. 8264  
 CHATTAH LAW GROUP  
 5875 S. Rainbow Blvd #204  
 Las Vegas, NV 89118  
 (702) 360-6200  
 sigal@thegoodlawyerlv.com

*Counsel for the Nevada  
 Republican Party*